

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT/PTC 13 JAN 2005

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

TBK-Patent
Leson, Thomas, Johannes, Alois
Bavariaring 4-6
D-80336 MÜNCHEN
Tyskland

RECEIVED
EINGEGANGEN

24. März 2004

TBK - PATENT

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

22-03-2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference

WO 33729

REPLY DUE

within 60 days from
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/IB 2002/002782

International filing date (day/month/year)

16.07.2002

Priority date (day/month/year)

- - -

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

H04Q 3/66, H03Q 3/00

Applicant

Nokia Corporation et al

1. ☐ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:

☐ is

☐ is not

considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This first (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6. For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is:

16.11.2004

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/SE

Patent- och registreringsverket
Box 5055
S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. 46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Stefan Hansson/mj

Telephone No. 46 8 782 25 00

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

17.5.04

WV 3A4

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB 2002/002782

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

- ☐ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:
- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
 - ☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
 - ☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of (*replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."*):

- ☒ the international application as originally filed/furnished
- ☐ the description:
- pages _____ as originally filed/furnished
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ the claims:
- pages _____ as originally filed/furnished
- pages _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ the drawings:
- pages _____ as originally filed/furnished
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB 2002/002782

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims

Claims

1, 23

Inventive step (IS)

Claims

Claims

1-5, 10, 23-28

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims

Claims

2. Citations and explanations:

The claimed invention

The claimed invention relates to a method and a system for routing a message or a set of messages or a session from a first equipment connected or registered to a first network, to a second equipment connected or registered to a second network.

The following document were cited in the International Search Report:

D1: WO 99 11 087 A2

D2: WO 02 43 405 A1

D3: WO 00 79 825 A1

D1 relates to a method and a system for processing calls for communication equipment with a subscriber number ported from a first operator to a second operator. D1 describes on page 2 lines 4-23 that each communication network forms a database of ported (routed) numbers. The database is accessible from at least one gateway exchange and the subscriber numbers ported from one operator to another are stored together with information about the network to which the subscriber numbers belong. Upon an incoming call (setup request), the called subscriber number is compared with the subscriber numbers in the database; and on the basis of the result of that comparison, routing information for the further processing of the call is composed. This implies that when checking the database for ported subscriber number, if the call is to be routed to another network, the first type of address is transformable/translatable to a second type of address. Consequently, the claimed invention as in claims 1 and 23 is not novel.

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB 2002/002782

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: V

D1 does not specify that a second database is used to derive the address of a contact point of the second network in the first network. However, that is considered an obvious measure to a person skilled in the art.

It is also considered obvious that also other requirements may be checked, apart from the translation between address types.

Consequently the claimed invention as in claims 2-5 and 24-28 is considered to lack an inventive step.

D1 does not state that a Serving Call State Control Function (S-CSCF) performs the requirement checking step. However, a person skilled in the art would most definitely realise that an S-CSCF would be a suitable entity to be in charge of the requirement checking step. It is also described in D2 that a CSCF is in charge of handling calls for a roamed subscriber; and as such, the CSCF is in charge of the requirement checking step. Consequently, the claimed invention as in claim 10 is considered to lack an inventive step.

D3 is considered to merely disclose the state of the art and is not commented on further.